UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,248	07/29/2003	Stephen Mark Mueller	P23666	5445
7055 7590 08/07/2007 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.			EXAMINER	
1950 ROLAND	CLARKE PLACE	•	BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R	
RESTON, VA 20191			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	
		·		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

_ /
CV.
γγ.
<i>u</i>

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/628,248 MUELLER ET AL. Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary Examiner **Art Unit** 2155 Benjamin R. Bruckart All Participants: Status of Application: FINAL (1) Benjamin R. Bruckart. (3) (2) Safet Metjahic, Reg. No. 58,677. (4) Date of Interview: 1 August 2007 Time: 2:30 EST pm. Type of Interview: ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Applicant's representative) If Yes, provide a brief description: Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: 103(a) by Pessi in view of 20040203664 by Lei Claims discussed: claims 12, 15, 19 Prior art documents discussed: 20040203664 by Lei Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet Part III. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant called examiner regarding confusion of a rejection which had been written as if rejected by Lei but cited with the wrong case number on the OA and 892. The examiner determined the correct patent publication no. to be 20040203664 as opposed to the cited 20040203644. The examiner communicated this with applicant who understood and agreed.